



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,506	02/22/2002	David G. McLeod	1062-013	9970

7590 12/29/2004

Scott A. Chapple  
Dobrusin & Thennisch PC  
Suite 311  
401 South Old Woodward Avenue  
Birmingham, MI 48009

EXAMINER

OMGBA, ESSAMA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3726

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/081,506	MCLEOD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Essama Omgba	3726	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-18,20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-18,20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al. (US Patent 6,493,920) in view of Miyazaki et al. (US Patent 4,883,310), Wandiez (US Patent 6,409,947) and Johnston (US Patent 4,712,287).

With regards to claims 1 and 5, Hill et al. discloses a method of assembling a roof module 14 to an automotive vehicle, the method comprising providing the roof module 14 wherein the roof module includes a roof portion 60 having at least one edge, a transparent panel 62 having a bottom edge adapted for attachment to a body of the automotive vehicle during assembly of the automotive vehicle, and a top edge that is secured to the roof portion adjacent the at least one edge of the roof portion wherein the transparent panel is a windshield, and assembling the roof module to a body portion of the automotive vehicle, see column 2, lines 43-62. Hill et al. does not disclose the top edge of the windshield being adhesively secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion and the roof portion including a roof panel with a foam-in-place headliner. However it is known to adhesively secure a windshield to an edge of a roof portion as attested by Miyazaki et al., see column 4, lines 45-48. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 3726

to have adhesively secured the top edge of the windshield to the roof portion in the method of Hill et al., in light of the teachings of Miyazaki et al., in order to impart additional structural integrity to the automobile body. Furthermore it is known to use foam-in-place headliners as attested by Wandiez, see column 5, lines 62-67, column 6, lines 1-55. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a roof portion including a roof panel and a foam-in-place headliner to the roof module of Hill et al./Miyazaki, in light of the teachings of Wandiez, in order to reduce the amount of parts and complexity introduced to an automotive assembly plant. Applicant should note that it is known to use gaskets to encapsulate the peripheral edge of a windshield in order to provide a seal against the intrusion of fluids between the windshield and the frame of the vehicle in which it is installed as attested by Johnston, see column 5, lines 12-16. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have included an encapsulation covering with the windshield of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Wandiez, in light of the teachings of Johnston, in order to provide a seal against the intrusion of between the windshield and the frame of the vehicle in which it is installed.

For claim 3, see column 2, line 18 of Hill et al. and column 4, lines 45-48 of Miyazaki et al.

For claim 4, see column 2, lines 58-62 of Hill et al.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al. in view of Miyazaki et al. and Johnston.

Hill et al. discloses a method of assembling a roof module 14 to an automotive vehicle, the method comprising providing the roof module 14 wherein the roof module includes a roof portion 60 having at least one edge, a transparent panel 62 having a bottom edge adapted for attachment to a body of the automotive vehicle during assembly of the automotive vehicle, and a top edge that is secured to the roof portion adjacent the at least one edge of the roof portion wherein the transparent panel is a windshield, and assembling the roof module to a body portion of the automotive vehicle; see column 2, lines 43-62. Hill et al. does not disclose the top edge of the windshield being adhesively secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion and the windshield including an encapsulation covering at least a portion of one of the edges of the windshield. However it is known to adhesively secure a windshield to an edge of a roof portion as attested by Miyazaki et al., see column 4, lines 45-48. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adhesively secured the top edge of the windshield to the roof portion in the method of Hill et al., in light of the teachings of Miyazaki et al., in order to impart additional structural integrity to the automobile body. Furthermore it is known to use gaskets to encapsulate the peripheral edge of a windshield in order to provide a seal against the intrusion of fluids between the windshield and the frame of the vehicle in which it is installed as attested by Johnston, see column 5, lines 12-16. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have included an encapsulation covering with the windshield of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al., in light of the teachings of Johnston, in order to provide a seal

against the intrusion of between the windshield and the frame of the vehicle in which it is installed.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Wandiez/Johnston as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Meritor Automotive (February 2000).

Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Wandiez/Johnston discloses a method of assembling a roof module to an automotive vehicle as shown above except for the roof portion including at least one vehicle impact counter measure. However Meritor Automotive teaches head area air bags as integrated components of a roof module, see page titled "Integrated components". Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided the roof portion of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Wandiez/Johnston with head area air bags, in light of the teachings of Meritor Automotive, for increased protection of the vehicle's occupants.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Wandiez/Johnston as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hsieh (US Patent 5,115,086).

Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Wandiez/Johnston discloses a method of assembling a roof module to an automotive vehicle as shown above except for the top edge of the transparent panel being adhesively secured to the roof portion with a urethane adhesive. However it is known to use a urethane adhesive in bonding a windshield to an auto body as attested by Hsieh, see column 1, lines 13-19. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to

have used a urethane adhesive in the method of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Wandiez/Johnston, in view of the teachings of Hsieh, in order to impart additional structural integrity to the auto body.

6. Claims 9, 10, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al. in view of Miyazaki et al. and Hsieh.

With regards to claims 9, 13 and 16, Hill et al. discloses a method of assembling a roof module 14 to an automotive vehicle, the method comprising providing the roof module 14 wherein the roof module includes a roof portion 60 having a forward edge, a rearward edge, a pair of side edges and a pair of A-pillars 52 extending adjacent opposing corners of the roof portion, and a windshield 62 having a top edge, a bottom edge and a pair of side edges wherein the top edge of the wind shield is secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion and the side edges of the windshield are secured to the A-pillars, the bottom edge is configured for attachment to a body portion of the automotive vehicle upon assembly of the roof module to the automotive vehicle, and the A-pillars and the body portion of the vehicle include corresponding mating structures (56, 40) for assisting in assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle, and assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle by matingly fitting the mating structures of the A-pillars and the mating structures of the body portion and by adhesively securing the windshield to the body portion of the vehicle, see column 2, lines 18-27 and 43-67, column 3, lines 1-7 and figure 2. Hill et al. does not disclose the top edge of the windshield being adhesively secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion. However it is

Art Unit: 3726

known to adhesively secure a windshield to and edge of a roof portion as attested by Miyazaki et al., see column 4, lines 45-48. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adhesively secured the top edge of the windshield to the roof portion in the method of Hill et al., in light of the teachings of Miyazaki et al., as is conventional in the art. Although Hill et al./Miyazaki et al. does not disclose the adhesive as being a urethane adhesive, however it is known to use a urethane adhesive in bonding a windshield to an auto body as attested by Hsieh, see column 1, lines 13-19. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used a urethane adhesive in the method of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al., in view of the teachings of Hsieh, in order to impart additional structural integrity to the auto body. Although Hill et al./Miyazaki/Hsieh does not disclose connecting the roof portion of the vehicle to a pair of B-pillars and to a pair of C-pillars of the automotive vehicle body, however such connection of the roof module to the vehicle body is known as attested by Lumpe et al., see column 1, lines 41-54, column 2, lines 1-9 and 27-67, and column 3, lines 1-8. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have connected the roof portion of Hill et al./Miyazaki/Hsieh to a pair of B-pillars and a pair of C-pillars, in light of the teachings of Lumpe et al., in order to provide additional stiffening of the body of the vehicle.

For claim 10, see column 1, lines 21-25 of Hsieh.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al. in view of Miyazaki et al., Hsieh and Allen et al. (US Patent 6,423,755).



Hill et al. discloses a method of assembling a roof module 14 to an automotive vehicle, the method comprising providing the roof module 14 wherein the roof module includes a roof portion 60 having a forward edge, a rearward edge, a pair of side edges and a pair of A-pillars 52 extending adjacent opposing corners of the roof portion, and a windshield 62 having a top edge, a bottom edge and a pair of side edges wherein the top edge of the wind shield is secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion and the side edges of the windshield are secured to the A-pillars, the bottom edge is configured for attachment to a body portion of the automotive vehicle upon assembly of the roof module to the automotive vehicle, and the A-pillars and the body portion of the vehicle include corresponding mating structures (56, 40) for assisting in assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle, and assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle by matingly fitting the mating structures of the A-pillars and the mating structures of the body portion and by adhesively securing the windshield to the body portion of the vehicle, see column 2, lines 18-27 and 43-67, column 3, lines 1-7 and figure 2. Hill et al. does not disclose the top edge of the windshield being adhesively secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion. However it is known to adhesively secure a windshield to an edge of a roof portion as attested by Miyazaki et al., see column 4, lines 45-48. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adhesively secured the top edge of the windshield to the roof portion in the method of Hill et al., in light of the teachings of Miyazaki et al., as is conventional in the art. Although Hill et al./Miyazaki et al. does not disclose the adhesive

Art Unit: 3726

as being a urethane adhesive, however it is known to use a urethane adhesive in bonding a windshield to an auto body as attested by Hsieh, see column 1, lines 13-19. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used a urethane adhesive in the method of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al., in view of the teachings of Hsieh, in order to impart additional structural integrity to the auto body. Furthermore roof portions including a roof rail assembly having structural foam disposed therein are known as attested by Allen et al., see column 12, lines 37-43. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided structural foam to the roof rail of the roof portion of Hill et al./Miyazaki/Hsieh, in light of the teachings of Allen et al., in order to structurally stiffen the roof rails.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Hsieh as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Bergholz et al. (US Patent 6,151,539).

Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Hsieh discloses a method of assembling a roof module to an automotive vehicle as shown above except for the roof portion including at least a portion of a global positioning system. However Bergholz et al. teaches a global positioning system mounted on the roof of a vehicle, see column 6, lines 34-36. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have included a global positioning system in the roof of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Hsieh, in light of the teachings of Bergholz et al., in order to achieve high precision finding while driving the vehicle.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al. in view of Miyazaki et al., Hsieh and Johnston.

Hill et al. discloses a method of assembling a roof module 14 to an automotive vehicle, the method comprising providing the roof module 14 wherein the roof module includes a roof portion 60 having a forward edge, a rearward edge, a pair of side edges and a pair of A-pillars 52 extending adjacent opposing corners of the roof portion, and a windshield 62 having a top edge, a bottom edge and a pair of side edges wherein the top edge of the wind shield is secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion and the side edges of the windshield are secured to the A-pillars, the bottom edge is configured for attachment to a body portion of the automotive vehicle upon assembly of the roof module to the automotive vehicle, and the A-pillars and the body portion of the vehicle include corresponding mating structures (56, 40) for assisting in assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle, and assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle by matingly fitting the mating structures of the A-pillars and the mating structures of the body portion and by adhesively securing the windshield to the body portion of the vehicle, see column 2, lines 18-27 and 43-67, column 3, lines 1-7 and figure 2. Hill et al. does not disclose the top edge of the windshield being adhesively secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion. However it is known to adhesively secure a windshield to and edge of a roof portion as attested by Miyazaki et al., see column 4, lines 45-48. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adhesively secured the top edge of the windshield to the

Art Unit: 3726

roof portion in the method of Hill et al., in light of the teachings of Miyazaki et al., as is conventional in the art. Although Hill et al./Miyazaki et al. does not disclose the adhesive as being a urethane adhesive, however it is known to use a urethane adhesive in bonding a windshield to an auto body as attested by Hsieh, see column 1, lines 13-19. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used a urethane adhesive in the method of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al., in view of the teachings of Hsieh, in order to impart additional structural integrity to the auto body. Furthermore it is known to use gaskets to encapsulate the peripheral edge of a windshield in order to provide a seal against the intrusion of between the windshield and the frame of the vehicle in which it is installed as attested by Johnston, see column 5, lines 12-16. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have included an encapsulation covering with the windshield of Hill et al./Miyazaki, in light of the teachings of Johnston, in order to provide a seal against the intrusion of between the windshield and the frame of the vehicle in which it is installed.

10. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Hsieh as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Meritor Automotive (February 2000).

Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Hsieh discloses a method of assembling a roof module to an automotive vehicle as shown above except for the roof portion including at least one vehicle impact counter measure. However Meritor Automotive teaches head area air bags as integrated components of a roof module, see page titled "Integrated

Art Unit: 3726

components". Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have provided the roof portion of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Hsieh with head area air bags, in light of the teachings of Meritor Automotive, for increased protection of the vehicle's occupants.

11. Claims 17, 18, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hill et al. in view of Miyazaki et al., Hsieh, Bhat et al. (US Patent 6,133,398) and Lumpe et al. (US Patent 6,592,176).

With regards to claims 17, 18 and 20, Hill et al. discloses a method of assembling a roof module 14 to an automotive vehicle, the method comprising providing the roof module 14 wherein the roof module includes a roof portion 60 having a forward edge, a rearward edge, a pair of side edges and a pair of A-pillars 52 extending adjacent opposing corners of the roof portion, and a windshield 62 having a top edge, a bottom edge and a pair of side edges wherein the top edge of the wind shield is secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion and the side edges of the windshield are secured to the A-pillars, the bottom edge is configured for attachment to a body portion of the automotive vehicle upon assembly of the roof module to the automotive vehicle, and the A-pillars and the body portion of the vehicle include corresponding mating structures (56, 40) for assisting in assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle, and assembling the roof module to the body portion of the vehicle by matingly fitting the mating structures of the A-pillars and the mating structures of the body portion and by adhesively securing the windshield to the body portion of the vehicle, see column 2, lines 18-27 and 43-67, column 3, lines 1-7 and

Art Unit: 3726

figure 2. Hill et al. does not disclose the top edge of the windshield being adhesively secured to the roof portion adjacent the forward edge of the roof portion. However it is known to adhesively secure a windshield to an edge of a roof portion as attested by Miyazaki et al., see column 4, lines 45-48. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adhesively secured the top edge of the windshield to the roof portion in the method of Hill et al., in light of the teachings of Miyazaki et al., as is conventional in the art. Although Hill et al./Miyazaki et al. does not disclose the adhesive as being a urethane adhesive, however it is known to use a urethane adhesive in bonding a windshield to an auto body as attested by Hsieh, see column 1, lines 13-19. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used a urethane adhesive in the method of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al., in view of the teachings of Hsieh, in order to impart additional structural integrity to the auto body. Furthermore it is known to use adhesives having an elongation that is greater than about 300 percent in bonding an automobile windshield to the windshield frame as attested by Bhat et al., see column 1, lines 14-21, column 2, lines 23-32, column 14, lines 62-67 and column 15, lines 1-10. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used an adhesive having an elongation that is greater than about 300 percent in the method of Hill et al./Miyazaki et al./Hsieh, in light of the teachings of Bhat et al., in order to provide enhanced bond strength and shorten production time. Although Hill et al./Miyazaki/Hsieh/Bhat et al. does not disclose connecting the roof portion of the vehicle to a pair of B-pillars and to a pair of C-pillars of

Art Unit: 3726

the automotive vehicle body, however such connection of the roof module to the vehicle body is known as attested by Lumpe et al., see column 1, lines 41-54, column 2, lines 1-9 and 27-67, and column 3, lines 1-8. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have connected the roof portion of Hill et al./Miyazaki/Hsieh/Bhat et al. to a pair of B-pillars and a pair of C-pillars, in light of the teachings of Lumpe et al., in order to provide additional stiffening of the body of the vehicle.

For claim 21, Official Notice is taken in that it is known to assemble a roof module in one area and assemble it to a body portion of an automotive vehicle in another area.

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed August 18, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the motivation for combining the Johnston reference with Hill et al. and Miyazaki is unclear, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The referenced portion of Johnston reads "The gaskets portions 34, 35, 36 and 37 completely encapsulate the peripheral edge of the glass sheet 32 to provide a seal against the intrusion of fluids between the windshield and the frame of the vehicle in which it is installed" (Johnston, col. 5, lines 12-16). This portion is clearly referenced in the Office action although part of the quotation itself is missing from the Office action. A lecture of the cited portion would have provided Applicant with the needed understanding.

In response to Applicant's argument that the examiner has repeatedly failed to show a reference that discloses an adhesive securing of a "bottom end" of a transparent panel to a body portion of a vehicle in conjunction with the assembling of a roof module to the body portion of the vehicle, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Hill et al. has been cited with pertinent portions provided to Applicant in the various Office actions. As outlined again in the above rejections, Hill et al. teaches the roof assembly 14 (including windshield 62) is suitably secured to the metallic base frame 16 of the cab 12 by any suitable fastening means (col.2, lines 63-65). "Examples of suitable fastening means include but are not limited to welding such as MIG welding, plasma welding, laser welding, riveting, **adhesive bonding**, and magnetic compression joining" (Hill et al. col. 3, lines 1-3). As seen in figure 2, it is clear that the bottom portion of windshield 62 will be secured to frame 16 as is conventional in the art. The examiner does not understand why Applicant continues to argue this point.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no indication from any of the references that the use of an adhesive having an elongation of about 300 percent is likely to shorten production time, the examiner would like to direct Applicant's attention to Bhat et al., col. 2, lines 23-32. Additionally the use of such adhesive is known in bonding windshields to vehicle frames; advantages include enhanced lap shear strengths and impact energy strength, see Bhat et al., col. 1, lines 45-55.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no indication from any of the references that attachment of a roof module would provide a stiffer body of an automobile, the examiner would like to direct Applicant to col. 1, lines 41-67 of Lumpe et



al. Other advantages are also provided. Furthermore the examiner would like to point out that vehicles with B-pillars and C-pillars are well known in the art and that it is within the general knowledge of those of ordinary skill in the art to provide appropriate roof panels to vehicle models having B and C-pillars.

In response to Applicant's argument that taken an "Official Notice" is inadequate in rejecting claim 20, the examiner would like to point out that claim 21 and not claim 20 was rejected using an "Official Notice". Support for that notice could be found in the Johnston reference, col. 6, lines 66-68, col. 7, lines 1-2 and col. 9, lines 10-14.

In view of the above remarks, the examiner maintains that a prima facie case of obviousness has been established in the instant application.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3726


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Essama Omgba whose telephone number is (571) 272-4532. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Essama Omgba  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3726